

## Appendix

### Complete Listing of Group Flip Chart Notes

#### *Should we change the thresholds for expanding the urban growth boundaries (UGBs)?*

##### Group #1

- Multi-mini urban plan
- Light industrial parks
- 75/25 between urban center
- Dispersed work/commercial
- Residential areas spread out traffic and housing

##### Group # 2

- Change/review thresholds (75%/50%)
- Do it more frequently (less than 5 years)
- Modify threshold by area (concentrate on I-5 corridor)
- Pursue higher threshold (more urban density first before moving)

##### Group # 4

- Increase thresholds to assure efficiency
- Arrival inventory of vacant buildable lands

##### Group # 5

- Minimum densities for each city
- Move boundaries every update

##### Group # 6

- Capacity of services to provide service to the area
- Why are we building schools on the edge of the growth boundary and not allowing housing nearby

##### Group # 7

- Change with time and growth

##### Group # 8

- Has county looked at what other communities are doing
- What could we learn from them, do different

##### Group # 9

- Why isn't industrial land being used? Should it be designated as industrial wetlands?
- We should designate industrial land now instead of limiting it to % and that that will allow future options for landowners and better planning info

- Instead of limiting buildable lands to a specific plan, the market should drive residential housing and be reviewed yearly to allow for future planning options

#### Group # 10

- In handout- revise every 5 years based on population
- Move boundary before changing designations in existing UGA
- Infill and upzone before moving boundaries
- Capital facilities efficiencies

#### Group # 11

- Increase residential threshold to 80%
- Meaning: environmental benefits, better urban form, better quality of life

### ***How do we provide people with opportunities for input in plans for their neighborhoods?***

#### Group # 1

- More inclusive neighborhood association
- Better notice requirements to individuals
- Pre-development planning rules
- Neighborhood association involvement in land use/zoning decisions

#### Group # 2

- Wider and longer notification of development/rezone proposals (even if more money from taxes)
- Adjust notification requirements to size, impact of development
- Educate public regarding process
- Designate a com development staff person for neighborhood association
- Allow neighborhood association to be involved in rezone application from start

#### Group # 3

- More neighborhood planning

#### Group # 4

- Greater notification of developments
- Use neighborhood association for more input
- More outreach than current notification

#### Group # 5

- Do sub-area plans
- Increase use of web sites to communicate with neighborhoods

#### Group # 6

- Allow neighborhood associations to develop standards for development in their boundaries (e.g. landscaping)
- Add a review layer that incorporates community input
- The current system of public hearings is frustrating because it just reviews regulations

#### Group # 7

- Should be proactive
- How does this relate to rural areas?

#### Group # 8

- No new option issues
- Add more option A
- Supermarket flyers
- Direct mailings
- Works fine
- Columbian ads late

#### Group # 9

- Allow each community to personalize planning and future growth according to existing trends except where improvement of the area is needed
- How can we change zoning to allow for better pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods and shopping areas before they are built?
- Require consultation with neighborhood residents for appropriate design considerations as part of the development proposal

#### Group # 10

- County provide web site development and maintenance support for neighborhood associations and homeowners associations
- Larger newsletter mailing budget, 2x per year

#### Group # 11

- Developers required to bring plans to community groups
- Meaning: more input, save staff costs

## Major Policy Questions Worksheet

### HOW MUCH GROWTH?

#### 1. What population forecast will be used?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) <b>Low – 419,188</b>	1 (5)	2 (4)	3 (39)
b) <b>Medium – 497,199</b>	1 (19)	2 (15)	3 (13)
c) <b>High – 587,622</b>	1 (26)	2 (14)	3 (10)

**Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?**

- *So infrastructure will be planned for.*
- What are the implications for each choice? If you plan for high growth, do you then work to achieve high growth? Is it just a facilitation for developers?
- *Yes – no growth from tax incentives*
- We need to look at present growth rate (last 2 years) to project growth rate to use for 2012 and 2020
- *Do we want to look for creative and compassionate way to slow growth?*

**Other implications? Comments?**

- Planning for too much growth will encourage & promote growth. We don't need encouragement.
- We have already provided enough rental opportunities for the more affluent.
- *Protect our airports.*
- Need to closely monitor so as not to overspend what is needed.
- *Plan capital facilities with import fees high enough to pay for what is needed.*
- If growth is kept lower it is easier to manage. Biased on Board of Comm they are all pro-contractor so therefore I think it is probably better to plan for high growth.
- *I favor lots of environmentally sensitive growth, especially industrial commercial jobs.*

## WHERE TO GROW?

### 2. Should we change the thresholds for expanding the urban growth boundaries?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) <b>Keep existing thresholds—75% of buildable residential/commercial or 50% of buildable industrial must already be developed.</b>	1 (18)	2 (8)	3 (16)
b) <b>Rely on a 20-year population forecast rather than setting buildable lands thresholds.</b>	1 (22)	2 (9)	3 (14)

**Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?**

- *Need more.*
- Add to option b: looking at it every 5 years
- *Revise at least every 5 yrs according to growth*
- Change to 80% threshold – look what else is being done elsewhere.
- *Are the existing plans cut in stone or is there flexibility in the plan?*
- Plant trees.
- *Like to see a higher threshold.*
- Possibly change thresholds, possibly change time frame for re-evaluation.
- *Capacity of local infrastructure need apply.*
- Need to have thresholds, but need to be realistic-need to seriously consider new proposal by cities.

## Other implications? Comments?

- *If there are buildable lands within UGA that is not being built on, how does county help owners or urge owners (incentives) to develop?*
- *Has the need changed in any area because of zoning i.e. homes too close to industrial/commercial sites?*
- *Expanding the UGA should be based upon the facility availability.*
- *We are building schools on edge city, but not allowing homes to be built where schools are. Also, we need multi-family near work and county/rural areas so travel will be reduced.*
- *I like neither option – infrastructure first. Protect our airports.*
- *Haven't we blown this forecast (20 yr) out of the water? We should revise every five years. With Portland metro boundaries so tight, face it. It's coming here if we let it. Let's get some jobs over here!*
- *What did other communities do (i.e.: Issaquah & Bellevue, WA)? What would they have done differently if they could do it again?*
- *Do not decrease concurrency standards!*
- *Need more options.*
- *Option B will result in chaos, it renders planning on only a 5 years basis*
- *Concerned that land considered buildable not really so. I commented at city planning meeting about map. Please leave some open trees!!*

## WHERE TO GROW?

### 3. How should projected population be allocated to each jurisdiction?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) <b>Keep method used to prepare current plan--allocate to maintain the percentage of county population living within each individual urban growth area.</b>	1 (7)	2 (15)	3 (24)
b) <b>Allocate based on growth rates of individual urban growth areas over the last ten years.</b>	1 (17)	2 (17)	3 (13)
c) <b>Allocate based on amount of buildable residential lands in each urban growth area.</b>	1 (16)	2 (18)	3 (11)
With a ceiling -	1 (3)	2 (4)	3 (2)

#### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *Build near jobs – also how many jobs are to Portland? History in high growth area is meaningless.*
- *Growth near industries.*
- *Residential.*
- *Consider new employment locations – weight growth areas near new jobs.*
- *Growth near jobs created.*

- First you have to decide if the UGB can be moved. If not, you can only put a defined amount of population within the existing UGB.
- *Building should be near industries (jobs).*
- Building to be next to jobs.
- *Allocate zoning of residential lands near jobs, commercial.*
- Jobs and transportation connection.

#### **Other implications? Comments?**

- *One cannot compare LaCenter with Vancouver. Need different methods for different UGA's.*
- Available land and population estimates should be considered together, to get the percentage.
- *Build*
- Depends on what # and kinds of jobs and location of jobs. Ridgefield Junction and Indian Casino.
- *Plant trees and flowers.*
- Assure infrastructure first, then growth - stop tax incentives. Protect airports.
- *I would like to see an alternative which incorporated available land with an assumption as to density as defined by each urban area.*
- The small towns don't have the means to compete for jobs, thus become bedroom communities.
- *Transportation to jobs remains and major shopping continues cross county. Encouraging max. growth in small towns adds to transportation problems and more infrastructure inefficiency.*
- Many small cities have had a very high growth rate but will probably not sustain these rates.
- *Since UGA was set by 1994 standards, c was based on a. GMA has in to provide growth distributed to various areas and be diversified.*
- The past growth is not where the future growth will be. Can we assess total building land that is not environmentally sensitive and correlate that with other data?
- *I disagree with the definition of buildable lands. Since this is questionable, nothing should be based on buildable lands.*

## **WHERE TO GROW?**

### **4. Should the plan continue to expect that 81% of new residential growth should occur in urban areas?**

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Yes	1 (14)	2 (16)	3 (13)
b) No. Plan for more growth in urban areas.	1 (16)	2 (14)	3 (15)
c) No. Plan for more growth in rural areas.	1 (19)	2 (5)	3 (23)
d) Limit rural development to the population accommodated by 2000 zoning.	1 (22)	2 (9)	3 (15)

**Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?**

- *Yes, new residential should be market driven – comp plan should not micro-manage where to build.*
- *Set a range for the rural population to fall within ex 17.5 to 22%.*
- *Plant trees and flowers.*
- *Make growth wait for infrastructure.*
- *“C” boundaries need to be revised*
- *Encourage growth in urban areas.*
- *Encourage growth to the North.*

**Other implications? Comments?**

- *What is the difference between b and d? How about more growth in urban and limit rural?*
- *Protect our airports.*
- *I don't want to see more 5 acre development. Plan in urban growth areas so that urbanization can take place efficiently. Plan this somehow – house location? Future utility corridors?*
- *What was the 81% based on? Boundary that changed? What was it before 1994 as to today's population location?*
- *Board of Comm will encourage otherwise!*

## WHERE TO GROW?

**5. Should we manage how urban reserves are developed to ensure they can transition to urban areas in the future?**

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Continue existing approach with 10-acre minimum lot size.	1 (12)	2 (11)	3 (24)
b) Keep urban reserves but do more detailed planning for them.	1 (28)	2 (14)	3 (5)
c) Rezone the urban reserve areas and move them into urban area but do not develop them until adequate services are available.	1 (23)	2 (10)	3 (16)

**Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?**

- *In regards to b) – get some \$ estimates.*
- *Infrastructure first.*
- *The idea of urban reserve areas tries to slow down growth. We have to try harder because: we are losing the battle, land is a finite resource, and we cannot keep increasing our use of gasoline.*

**Other implications? Comments?**

- *You can't create more areas that will require public services. We can't afford what we have.*

- Protect our airports.
- *Keep urban populations in cities. The county does not develop parks, etc.*
- I think areas have different needs, Camas vs. Vancouver transportation to work.
- *We can't handle the people we have.*
- *If infrastructure is there development should proceed.*

## HOW TO GROW/HOUSING?

### 6. Should we continue to set targets at 60% single-family and 40% multi-family for all urban areas?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Keep existing policy.	1 (1)	2 (11)	3 (31)
b) Set separate targets based on a community's size and its current land uses.	1 (31)	2 (8)	3 (6)
c) Establish new policy that allows no more than 75% of new housing to be single-family detached.	1 (6)	2 (23)	3 (19)
d) Establish new policy that requires 30% of new housing to be attached housing.	1 (7)	2 (17)	3 (18)
e) Replace existing policy with housing affordability policies.	1 (16)	2 (20)	3 (9)

#### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *I would like to see minimum requirements for the housing. I want good quality, livable homes. Parts of Vancouver – even new parts – are really “dumpy”. I want this place to be a desirable place to live, not just an option for tax rebels.*
- Market driven!
- *Plant trees no matter what.*
- Assure infrastructure – then growth without tax incentives.

#### Other implications? Comments?

- *Aren't these (options c and d) about the same thing?*
- This again should not be micro-managed – must be market driven.
- *Depends on where the schools are located.*
- Protect airport from incompatible development.
- *Keep density a priority where it makes for efficiency.*
- Not sure about how affordable



## HOW TO GROW/HOUSING?

### 7. Should we continue to plan for an average of 6 units per acre for new single-family detached housing and 16 units per acre for attached housing?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Keep existing goals.	1 (6)	2 (15)	3 (26)
b) Set goals for an overall countywide density for all housing types.	1 (2)	2 (15)	3 (28)
c) Set different goals for each urban area to achieve an overall countywide density.	1 (24)	2 (19)	3 (2)
d) Establish a tiered system designating average densities for cities and the unincorporated areas of UGAs based on their size. Major population centers would have higher density targets than small centers.	1 (25)	2 (16)	3 (5)
e) Increase housing density goals.	1 (7)	2 (10)	3 (30)
f) Decrease housing density goals.	1 (20)	2 (15)	3 (11)

#### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *6/16 goals are excessive for many areas. Lower i.e. 4/14 and incorporate a community design philosophy and methods rather than governing by lot size.*
- Density rate set by rate of population growth.
- *Plant trees.*
- Infrastructure are first then growth without tax incentives.

#### Other implications? Comments?

- *Too complex.*
- Protect our airport from incompatible development.
- *Keep 6/16 but allow smaller cities to take less density.*
- Land and gasoline are finite resources. In the long term we will be forced to face the constraint.
- *Why not plan for it?*
- Not explained so I could really understand, speaker said 6 acre was 5-6,000 sq ft, since an acre is 45, 000 sq ft that is not correct.

## HOW TO GROW/HOUSING?

### 8. How do we plan for new rural housing?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Keep existing approach of allowing zoning and the market to drive rural growth.	1 (15)	2 (15)	3 (20)
b) Allow more home sites in rural centers.	1 (29)	2 (7)	3 (11)
c) Allow market-driven rezoning of rural areas.	1 (16)	2 (10)	3 (23)
d) Change zoning to allow smaller minimum lot sizes.	1 (20)	2 (9)	3 (20)

#### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *Keep zoning but do NOT allow "market" to drive rural growth.*
- *Allow 5 ac. Minimum lot size in all rural areas. Allow less than 5 ac. where public water available.*
- *Allow more units as rentals without divisions. 2 units per lot.*
- *Cluster development.*
- *Plan for development by allowing for stream and wetlands mitigation.*
- *Five good idea, clusters for families good idea (6)*
- *Large impact fee for rezoning to smaller lot in rural areas*
- *Planned cluster develop.*

#### Other implications? Comments?

- *Don't allow developers to change pre-zoned large lot sizes to smaller ones.*
- *Minimum lot sizes of 10 to 80 ac. in rural areas ( areas that were not zoned in the 1970's or were zoned to 5 ac. minimum) severely restrict the owner's private property rights. This restriction is unjust. In my opinion these large minimum lot sizes amount to confiscation of property without compensation.*
- *Allow granny flats.*
- *I could support planned unit developments if they are clustered with open space/park land owned in common - never to be developed (see Parkside Airpark in BG).*
- *Regarding A) assure infrastructure without tax incentives. Also, protect our airports.*
- *Market driven rezoning renders planning meaningless*

## HOW TO GROW/JOB?

### 9. How should we plan for job growth?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Keep method used to prepare 1994 plan—allocate one job for every two residents by urban growth area.	1 (7)	2 (16)	3 (25)
b) Keep current industrial/commercial zoning and actively promote development of these areas.	1 (29)	2 (12)	3 (7)
c) Increase the amount of industrial/commercial lands designated in the comprehensive plan.	1 (20)	2 (16)	3 (13)

#### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *I would like to see an "industrial park" kind of commercial zoning. Attract clean, high-tech stuff (not just computers, but bio-tech, etc.)*
- *More industry in rural centers.*
- *Plant trees.*
- *(a) With tax incentives.*
- *"c" allow industry growth if wanted outside commercial zone*
- *"Punish" Oregon tax-wise, we keep being a donor county to OR/WA*
- *Reduce housing growth until jobs catch up.*

#### Other implications? Comments?

- *Jobs need to be planned near where people live.*
- *(c) Within existing industrial/commercial areas – expand existing. Brush Prairie should be removed from heavy industrial zoning.*
- *Protect our airports.*
- *Zoned land does not bring infrastructure. Infrastructure takes \$'s and staff/people. Small towns, Ridgefield/BG don't have what it takes to promote or meet industrial needs. Where does the county fit in promoting/bringing industry when the cities have the infrastructure? Does the county have a roll in helping small cities?*
- *Seek family wage jobs, which means industry not retail and service. Retail and service should follow, not lead growth. We must reduce the commuting to Oregon because we can't afford to build more bridges and highways (or, alternatively, build mass transit/rail).*
- *Afraid of where they would put (c).*

## HOW TO GROW/JOB?

### 10. Where should job growth be directed?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Direct growth to lands currently designated as industrial/commercial. Invest in infrastructure to bring them up to prime buildable status.	1 (34)	2 (8)	3 (7)
b) Increase amount of land in urban growth areas designated as industrial/commercial, allowing more potential growth in UGAs rather than in rural areas.	1 (13)	2 (21)	3 (13)
c) Increase amount of designated industrial/commercial land in both UGAs and rural areas, potentially dispersing job growth.	1 (17)	2 (8)	3 (24)

#### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *Regarding c) Only if you plan for light rail.*
- No tax incentives.
- *We must move toward eco-industrial parks in order to reduce consumption of energy.*
- Increase the UGB to allow more industrial/commercial. Keep them within the UGB.
- *If not enough, why not used?*
- Facility short falls.

#### Other implications? Comments?

- *We don't have the infrastructure.*
- Protect our airports.
- *No growth until funding is allowed.*

## HOW DO WE MAKE CLARK COUNTY A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE?

### 11. What levels of service should be planned for capital facilities such as roads, parks, water, sewer, schools, etc.?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Plan for high levels of service.	1 (31)	2 (6)	3 (12)
b) Plan for lower, more affordable levels of service.	1 (19)	2 (8)	3 (25)

### Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?

- *"No new taxes".*
- *Infrastructure develops with high permitted area of development.*
- *No building until infrastructure is in place to support it.*
- *Need something to prioritize what services would be provided.*
- *A lack of concurrence means no development!*
- *Do not plan for the same level of service for all capital facilities. Some service levels must be high, others can be acceptable even if lower.*
- *You can't decide level of service without coupling them with revenue sources. This description should always present cost for each level of service and necessary methods for citizens to fund each chosen level of service.*
- *Not allow unless services available*
- *Need a mixture of a and b*
- *Facilities funding shortfall.*
- *This should be separated – transportation should not be with parkland, water, schools, etc. It would be easier to vote on this issue by issue. Or plan for growth to only happen when high LOS is affordable.*
- *Use concurrency to limit growth. Keep high standard.*
- *Services should be mostly there for development to proceed.*

### Other implications? Comments?

- *Livability is crucial to making this place a long-term successful county/city. Attract the people and keep them happy. The jobs will gladly follow. If we can't do it right, don't do it.*
- *How does the avg find out about master plans?*
- *Work harder to get the job done.*
- *How to pay for it? Need to decide/determine before we vote on this!*
- *Like the idea of light rail.*
- *Protect our airports. In regards to b) keep current population ratio, improve infrastructure level.*
- *Also, need to reduce congestion on our roads.*
- *Must be closely monitored so as not to spend needlessly.*
- *I don't understand planning for unfundable projects. Do we need people dedicated to "outside" fund gathering? Goals need setting. A community of higher standards brings pride. How do we reach people who see no need for public service/taxes?*
- *Parks, schools, etc should be required.*
- *County should be better then state but priority.*
- *Even if plan for high levels if too exp for contractors the gov will just reduce the level of service.*

## HOW DO WE MAKE CLARK COUNTY A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE?

### 12. How do we plan in a way that addresses state and federal environmental laws?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) Make environmental protection a county priority.	1 (33)	2 (6)	3 (12)
b) Do the minimum to meet state and federal standards.	1 (15)	2 (7)	3 (28)

**Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?**

- *Long term. It's the right thing to do.*
- Infrastructure, Infrastructure, Infrastructure
- *(a) is an absolute must*
- Keep ahead of min requirements

**Other implications? Comments?**

- *Regarding option A - At what cost?*
- How could environmental protection NOT be a priority?
- *The reason we have lost our quality of life to a certain degree is because we have sacrificed environmental concerns for short term profits.*
- Protect airports.
- *I can't believe this is still a question. How much time does the county need to spend in court?*
- We can plan now, or pay later. We depend on the biosphere for life support.
- *There isn't enough time for citizens to work the plan. Developers have as much time to work on development but citizens only have 120 days at most to react.*
- Just do it – charge new construction enough to cover costs.
- *Don't change the concurrency requirements to make it easier – make it realistic and stick to it.*

## HOW DO WE MAKE CLARK COUNTY A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE?

### 13. How do we provide people with opportunities for input on plans for their neighborhoods?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don't Like It
a) <b>Develop proactive processes for neighborhood community-based planning.</b>	1 (31)	2 (10)	3 (10)
b) <b>Keep current processes in which neighborhoods and community organizations become involved at their own initiative.</b>	1 (11)	2 (21)	3 (19)

**Is there an option that you don't see on this list that you would prefer?**

- *Bring controversial issues to a public vote. Improve notification process for residents. Slightly increase staffing.*
- Infrastructure, infrastructure, infrastructure.
- *Individual public notice of projects and plans is necessary! Too much of current "notice" is too horribly vague and irrelevant. What "neighborhood" planning does the county do? Felida, Hazeldell are urban areas.*
- No definition of what "proactive process" would entail and costs.
- *Better communications with neighborhoods. What is going on, don't hide behind the appearance of fairness doctrine.*

### Other implications? Comments?

- If a development proposal required consultation before approval with the community nearby, many objections could be resolved to make the proposal more palatable. Requiring such a *“discussion forum” with a developer should not require added staff, but an advance step in any residential development proposal ( an particularly an infill proposal).* In many respects, the community has been omitted from the proposal.
- You can’t force community attendance but lack of attendance doesn’t mean people aren’t interested! Nevertheless, those (like me) who chose to be involved should be listened to with great care.
- *Protect quality of life. Protect airports.*
- Option A doesn’t have to be more staff oriented. Volunteers could work.
- *Proactive process is expensive and unsustainable. Initiative process is reactive and late in process of whatever the county is planning. People don’t want association meetings without meaningful immediate result.*
- Stop posting changes at intersections – causing traffic hazards. The problem is the commish don’t listen!
- *Clark County does a poor job of letting us know what’s going on. The county fails to advertise in advance of community meetings.*
- However, (a) would probably cause a need for more money.

## HOW DO WE MAKE CLARK COUNTY A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE?

### 14. What role should design standards play in addressing such things as the exterior appearance of structures, landscaping, etc.?

	Like It	Unsure Neutral	Don’t Like It
a) Develop countywide design standards to increase the quality and aesthetics of construction.	1 (24)	2 (13)	3 (13)
b) Do not pursue countywide design standards.	1 (11)	2 (6)	3 (33)
c) Provide neighborhoods with the opportunity to help develop design standards that apply specifically to their areas.	1 (42)	2 (6)	3 (3)

### Is there an option that you don’t see on this list that you would prefer?

- “Standards” does not necessarily mean “uniformity”. I want quality homes, but I like diversity.
- Minimum standard.
- Infrastructure.
- *Actually, A and C should be combined.*
- Possibly do a “minimum” of exterior standards
- *Much more, but needs to start with builders.*

- Where we grow.
- *Set minimum standards that are achievable with average costs.*

### Other implications? Comments?

- No CC&R's unless neighbors want them.
- *Neighborhoods should be proactively encouraged to develop neighborhood associations (neighborhoods that don't have them).*
- Develop countywide construction to hold cost. Most neighborhoods want architecturally similar houses.
- *Plant trees and flowers.*
- Protect our airports.

### Do you have any other comments or concerns?

- Listen to the citizens: No amphitheater! No asphalt plant!
- *Current plan terrible. Go back to zoning before our plan - different tax lots should all be buildable lots.*
- I've only lived in Vancouver for 13 months - thanks for including citizens to be a part of the planning - well organized and informative.
- *I'd like to see the county plan around the natural or established advantages the co. already has i.e. use of the rail line that travels through the co. diagonally which reaches to all of the urban areas. The line can be used for transport of people and goods. This allows for development of industrial land in even small communities in the rural areas.*
- Why is the general public expected to pay for developer interests? Developments should include costs for infrastructure, the public should not be lining the pockets of the developers! The environment seems to be the last issue of concern at times. Clearcuts are the prime example. We should not allow this practice anymore.
- *Poorly worded choices in many cases. Not very clear explanations. I wish that folks here could see first hand what happens when rural areas are developed. Once developed you NEVER get back what you have lost. Get smarter about how you zone and build in the urban areas. Stop catering to real estate developer interests that cry they can't afford to build and include infrastructure improvements with their development. Why do you assume that developers have a right to be rich and it is OK that the burden then falls on the people who live in the developed area? Go check out where and how the developers live.*
- Infill considerations have been postponed for later deliberations, but I think a most serious matter is redesign of infill criteria.
- *Build multi-family next to jobs. Change urban growth to build homes in vacant land next to schools.*
- Everyone should understand all of the costs of the UGB and the GM plan. If the citizens of Clark County want less density, more open/green space, then they must be willing to pay for it and absolutely NOT engage in economic taking of private property. Property owners must be compensated for loss of development rights.
- *Citizen involvement in this activity is pitiful. Where is everybody? Clark County has an opportunity to not be another King County.*
- It is paramount to have good data to plan with and as a beginning place.



- *The public has not faced the truth of our limited resources (petroleum, land, energy). The market (price system) does not anticipate looming shortages because it assumes complete fungibility (substitutability).*
- *Political leaders either don't believe there are limits, or they are afraid to lead. However, growth implicitly challenges our available resources (petroleum, land, other energy).*
- *Which model assures us that we won't become another San Fernando Valley or San Jose? If we do what we've always done, we will get what we've always gotten.*
- *It does not help to try to talk to neighborhoods after the homes are built. We need better design standards to quote builder before they start. Community development.*
- *Why was the plan for intensive clusters around industries like "HP and Wafer Tec" rejected? Why do a lot of the workers have to leave the job area and travel many miles to find affordable housing?*
- *The board of Commis will do what they want regardless of what we say. They want citizen involvement but when info given to them they didn't read it. That was an insult! I would like to see Clark Co be a very desirable place to live, this would mean standing firm on quality of levels of service, parks, etc. If it costs more to build, so be it. Unfortunately the contractors rule not the people.*
- *Let's plan for jobs to go with growth and parks, roads, schools, and good fishing.*